

Decision 02-06-041 June 27, 2002

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Investigation for the purpose of establishing a list for the fiscal years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 of existing and proposed crossings at grade of city streets, county roads or state highways in need of separation, or projects effecting the elimination of grade crossings by removal or relocation of streets or railroad tracks, or existing separation in need of alterations or reconstruction in accordance with Section 2452 of the Streets and Highways Code.

Investigation 01-07-008
(Filed July 12, 2001)

(See Appendix A for Appearances.)

**INTERIM OPINION ESTABLISHING PRIORITY LIST
FOR 2002 – 2003 FISCAL YEAR**

Summary

This Interim Order adopts the California Grade Separation Priority List for Fiscal Year 2002-2003, as required by Streets and Highways Code Section 2452. We order Investigation 01-07-008 to remain open until we issue our final order adopting the Grade Separation Priority List for Fiscal Year 2003 – 2004.

Background and Procedural History

We initiated this proceeding by issuing the above-numbered Order Instituting Investigation (OII) on July 12, 2001, to create the State's Grade Separation Program Priority List for Fiscal Years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004. The

list, which is created anew in alternate years, establishes the relative priorities for funding qualified projects to eliminate or alter hazardous railroad crossings under the Program. Projects for construction of new grade separations, alteration of existing grade separations, or elimination of grade crossings by removal or relocation of streets or railroad tracks are included in the list.

Section 190 of the Streets and Highways Code requires the State's annual budget to include \$15 million for funding these projects. Section 2450 *et seq.* of the Code sets out the procedure for administering these funds, and Section 2453 gives the California Transportation Commission (CTC) responsibility for allocating (distributing) the funds to qualified projects. Section 2452 requires this Commission by July 1 of each year to establish the priority list for projects and furnish it to the CTC for use in the fiscal year beginning on that date. Our procedure is to promulgate the list for the first fiscal year by issuing an interim decision, and then to revise the list for the second year by deleting projects for which funds were actually allocated in the first. We adopt the revised list by final decision in the second year of the proceeding, and begin the funding cycle again the following year by instituting a new proceeding.

To initiate the cycle for the current biennial proceeding the Commission's Rail Safety and Carriers Division (Staff) mailed written notification to railroads, light rail transit agencies, cities, counties, and other interested parties on May 1, 2001, notifying them of the deadline to file a nomination for each grade separation project they sought to have us include in the current priority list. The assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) established a procedural schedule for the proceeding by Ruling dated August 31, 2001, and accepted nominations in accordance with that schedule.

We received a total of 59 timely nominations for projects to be included in the current priority list. After conducting site inspections for each nominated

project, Staff produced a preliminary priority list, utilizing formulas initially developed by the Commission in 1975 and recently revised as required by Decision (D.) 00-08-020 in the previous biennial Grade Separation Priority List proceeding.¹ As in past proceedings, the OII required nominating parties to appear personally at hearings to update, clarify, or explain each nomination as necessary, so that we could accurately finalize the list in this order.

The ALJ held these hearings in San Francisco and Los Angeles between February 25 and March 5, 2002. At the conclusion of the hearings the ALJ struck one nomination by the City of Redding and two by the Union Pacific Railroad from the record, because the nominating party either had not attended the hearing as required by OP 8 of the OII, or had indicated an intention to abandon a nomination. Certain parties submitted supplemental information following the hearing at the request of Staff or the ALJ, or on their own motion. The record was closed and the proceeding was submitted on April 15, and Staff has used the updated and corrected information to rework the list into its present form.

The order instituting this investigation categorized this proceeding as quasi-legislative. The Scoping Ruling confirmed this categorization.

The Current Formula

Before turning to the new priority list, we must resolve a controversy concerning the formulas used by Staff to establish the recommended priority

¹ Ordering Paragraph (OP) 6 of D.00-08-020 required Staff to conduct a workshop for the purpose of revising these formulas. Commencing with a workshop that convened on December 6, 2000, Staff entertained proposals to modify the formulas and accepted written comments from interested parties. After considering the workshop discussion and written comments, Staff issued its recommendations to the Commission in a report dated June 5, 2001. The Commission specifically adopted the formulas recommended by Staff for use in this investigation (OII, page 4).

rating for each project.² As stated above, we adopted that formula after Staff developed it by conducting a workshop mandated by our final decision in the previous proceeding.

The formula we adopted after the workshop involves a significant departure from past practice. To develop the current priority list Staff used the amount of State funds requested, rather than the total estimated cost of the project, to define the project cost in the denominator of the formula. Under Streets and Highways Code Section 2454 (g) each project to improve or eliminate an individual grade crossing is subject to a \$5 million cap, and because the actual construction cost for most nominated projects exceeds that cap, the consequence of making the change was that most of the nominations showed \$5 million as the project cost in the formula. This affected the priority rankings of individual projects whose cost will exceed that figure.

The representative for the City of Bakersfield and Kern County, joined by several others from rural jurisdictions, objected to the use of this new method, because it tended to lower the priority rankings of projects they nominated. They argue that projects of equivalent cost and type in larger urban areas are favored, and that there is a bias in the formula because the numerator incorporates such factors as accident history and traffic volumes. This amplifies the impact of the numerator when the denominator decreases or is capped at the \$5 million level. The objecting parties urge us to return to our former practice in

² Two different formulas were used to make these computations, one for crossings nominated for separation or elimination, and another for existing separations nominated for alteration or reconstruction. However, because the controversy concerns an identical term used in both formulas, we refer to the formula in the singular for the sake of simplicity.

order to restore their projects to previous priority rankings, and argue that to do otherwise would be unfair.

Staff conducted sensitivity tests to ascertain the effect of making the change in the formula, and acknowledges that the change in methodology to some degree had the effect claimed by these parties. However, the change from past practice reflects the reality that, while the cost of the grade crossing projects has dramatically increased in the 45 years since the Legislature created the program, the total amount of annual funding available for all single crossing improvement projects—\$15 million—historically has not increased from year to year. Even though funding for an individual project is limited by Section 2454(g) essentially to one-third of the total funds appropriated for grade separation projects for a given year or \$5 million (whichever is less), sufficient funds in reality are never available to fund all qualifying projects, even to the extent of this cap, because of the large number of projects nominated for funding.

The available funding is distributed according to priority ranking, rather than being proportionally allocated to every qualifying project on the list. In simple terms, the project on the list with the highest priority has first claim to the available funds to the extent of the cap, then the next in ranking, and so on until the fiscal year's funds are exhausted. The next fiscal year's list is comprised of the projects remaining after the first-year funds are allocated, removing those which were high enough on the list to be within reach of funding, met all of the allocation requirements by the first-year deadline, and actually received allocations. When the second fiscal year's funds are exhausted no more projects are funded, and the process of creating the list starts over. Some projects may wait years to qualify for an allocation, and others may never receive funds, depending on the number of higher priority projects that are nominated in each cycle.

Although this system may outwardly seem unfair to rural jurisdictions that have planned projects of great local significance, it is driven by risk level: grade crossings that pose the greatest hazard to public safety, wherever they may be located, are intentionally highest on the list. By extension, assuming they subsequently satisfy CTC's allocation requirements and receive funds at the earliest possible time, the most hazardous grade crossings will be the first to be eliminated, and the public safety will be optimally served. The list is dynamic, responding to local demographic changes, and some projects may be subordinated from year to year to new ones where factors such as rising vehicular traffic levels, increased train activity, or recent accident history indicate a greater public need for grade separation or improvement.³ The system is not one where the first to come to the table is necessarily the first to be served.

Many projects elevated on the priority list in each cycle are in crowded urban areas. Larger populations in these regions generate more vehicular traffic, so the potential for vehicular conflict with trains (assuming that an equal number

³ This analysis relates to projects for alteration or elimination of individual grade crossings, to which the \$5 million cap applies under Section 2454(g). Section 2454(h) permits funding of up to \$20 million for multiple-closure projects. The objecting parties and Caltrans note that initially showing a project cost of \$5 million on the nomination for such a project may raise its position on the priority list, but may also grossly understate its cost. This will probably disqualify it from subsequently receiving a supplemental allocation under Section 2454(h) by inflating the denominator, which lowers its putative priority rating.

Staff responds that this effect is mitigated by Staff's practice of treating any clearly separable portion of a multiple-crossing project as a separate nomination, and by combining the values for vehicle and train volumes, accident history, crossing geometry, and blocking delays, increasing the value of the numerator. The effect of changing the formula upon the rankings of these projects demonstrated by Staff's sensitivity analysis appears to confirm Staff's contention.

of train movements occur at comparable crossings slated for improvement) is greater, and there will be a greater number of accidents. Giving priority to the elimination of these busier crossings is good public policy: more lives will be saved.

We are cognizant of the hardship this system poses for rural jurisdictions that feel they are entitled to their “share of the pie.” Their desire to improve local streets and highways for the safety of their constituents, who are perhaps fewer in number, is undoubtedly as great as that of more populous jurisdictions, and intuitively they seem equally deserving. However, there is nothing we can do to alter the program, and the solution is not to go back to a methodology that favors the costliest projects and de-emphasizes population and traffic factors to the detriment of overall public safety.

All of the parties to this proceeding, including our Staff and that of the California Department of Transportation (which disburses the prioritized allocations on behalf of the CTC) agree that the Program is woefully underfunded. Annual inflation takes its toll, and even \$5 million is a pittance in relation to what the record indicates the cost is for a major grade crossing elimination project. If the State could make sufficient funds available, deserving projects everywhere would not go unfunded, and there would be no need for us to create a priority list to determine the order in which increasingly scarce funds are allocated until exhausted. However, unless the present situation changes, the number of worthwhile projects on the drawing board will increasingly outpace the State’s ability to provide funding assistance.

In order to carry out the intent of the Legislature when it established the program, we must create the priority list in a manner that optimizes public safety with the limited funds we administer. The methodology we have used in the past does not accomplish this goal as well as that which Staff recently developed

with the assistance of interested parties, and we will therefore not revert to using it. We will adopt the list created and recommended by Staff, using the methodology developed in the workshop.

The Fiscal Year 2002–2003 Priority List

The preliminary priority list was developed with the information submitted in the nominations before hearings were held. The principal function of the hearings was to correct errors and miscalculations when the formula was applied to that information. All nominating parties had a fair opportunity to do so, and any corrections furnished after the hearings were duly incorporated into creating the final list. The statutory procedure was correctly followed, and we will adopt without change the final list created by Staff.

Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision of ALJ Ryerson in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Pub. Util. Code § 311(d) and Rule 77.1 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure. We received comments from Robert Barton on behalf of the City of Bakersfield and Kern County, and from Ronald Ruettgers on behalf of the Greater Bakersfield Separation of Grade District. Both of these commenters had criticized the use of the current formula at the hearing, and both of them essentially reiterated their criticisms in their written comments and requested us to use a modified formula to create the priority list in this proceeding.

These comments indicate that the present version of the formula greatly amplifies the effect of accident history in relation to other variables as compared to previous versions, and may skew certain other results. These comments also reinforce the opinion expressed by Caltrans in Exhibit 2A that the current formula may operate to discourage or prevent multiple-closure projects under Section 2454(h) from receiving funding or supplemental allocations.

These comments indicate that there is a need to reevaluate the formula before the next biennial funding cycle begins. However, neither the underlying conceptual difficulties raised by these comments nor the actual effect upon the current priority list (as subsequently tested by Staff) indicate that the current formula is invalid. As stated above, our OII directs the use of this formula in the current proceeding. This is not the appropriate forum in which to reevaluate it, and we will not do so.

We have modified Finding of Fact number 2 to reflect this more accurately. In response to a comment from Mr. Ruettgers, we have also corrected an inadvertent misstatement about the operation of Section 2454(g) in the opinion's discussion of the current formula.

Findings of Fact

1. Reasonable notice was afforded to all interested persons by mailing written notification to railroads, light rail transit agencies, cities, counties, and others on the service list compiled at the conclusion of the previous Grade Separation Priority List proceeding, advising them of the deadline to file a nomination for each grade separation project they desired to have us include in the current priority list.

2. The methodology utilized by Staff to rank the nominations for Fiscal Year 2002–2003 in priority order is that which we adopted in the OII, based upon the recommendation of Staff following the conclusion of the workshop conducted in accordance with OP 6 of D.00-08-020.

3. In relying upon the adopted list CTC will be required to fully allocate funds first to the qualified project highest on the list, then to the next highest qualified project, and so forth, until all of the funds for the initial fiscal year are exhausted. Remaining qualified projects will be funded in the same manner for

Fiscal Year 2003–2004, after deletion of the projects that received allocations in Fiscal Year 2002–2003.

4. The Grade Separation Priority List attached as the Appendix to the Order consists of projects that were timely nominated, properly supported with information that has been received for the record, and put in priority order by Staff in accordance with the methodology we have adopted for this proceeding.

Conclusions of Law

1. Appendix B should be adopted by our Interim Order as the Fiscal Year 2002-2003 Grade Separation Priority List in this proceeding.
2. The effective date of the Interim Order must be no later than June 30, 2002, in order to satisfy the statutory deadline that applies to the current fiscal year.
3. This proceeding should remain open for the purpose of creating the Fiscal Year 2003–2004 Grade Separation Priority List.

INTERIM ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Pursuant to California Streets and Highways Code Section 2452 the Grade Separation Priority List attached as Appendix B hereto is established for Fiscal Year 2002–2003 as the list, in order of priority, of projects which the Commission determines to be most urgently in need of separation or alteration.
2. The Executive Director shall furnish a certified copy of this decision to the California Department of Transportation and the California Transportation Commission by not later than July 1, 2002.

3. Investigation 01-07-008 shall remain open until we issue our final order, and Staff shall take all necessary actions to establish the Grade Separation Priority List for Fiscal Year 2003–2004 in a timely manner, as required by law.

This order is effective today.

Dated June 27, 2002, at San Francisco, California.

LORETTA M. LYNCH
President
HENRY M. DUQUE
CARL W. WOOD
GEOFFREY F. BROWN
MICHAEL R. PEEVEY
Commissioners

APPENDIX A

List of Appearances

Applicants: Robert M. Barton, for Bakersfield, Kern County; Violet Jakab, for City of Lathrop; Ronald F. Ruettgers, for City of Shafter, City of Bakersfield, Kern County, Grater Bakersfield Separation of Grade District; Henry Sum and William J. Wagner, for City of San Jose; Gerald Brownfield and Mike Lydon, for Tehama County Public Works; Peggy Claassen and Kunle Odumade, for City of Fremont; Dick Dahllof, Joel Slavitt, and Christopher Payne, for JPB/Samtrans; Glen March, for Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority; Jerry Bradshaw, for Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board; Arsen Mangasarian, for City of Los Angeles; Tom Horne, for City of Palmdale; Richard Neill, for City of Irvine; Mark Yamarone for City of Santa Clarita; Gary Smart, for City of Camarillo; Philip Hannawi; for City of Riverside; Lawrence Tai, for Count of Riverside; Saeid Vaziry, for City of Fresno; Douglas Mays, for City of Montclair, City of Ontario, and San Bernardino Associated Governments; Kenneth Fung, for City of Rancho Cucamonga; Peter Wulfman, for San Bernardino County; Daryll Chenoweth, for Los Angeles County; and Jeff Amos, for City of Vista.

Interested Parties: O. J. Solander, Thomas W. Glover, and Matthew B. George, for Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

State Service: Sarita Sarvate and Rosa Munoz, Rail Safety and Carriers Division.

(END OF APPENDIX A)

APPENDIX B – Grade Separation Priority List I.01-07-008 for Fiscal Year 2002-2003 by Rank (page 1 of 6)

	Agency	Crossing Location	PUC ID	DOT ID	Railroad	VEH	TRN	LTRN	COST	AH/ WC	BD/H C	VS/ SR	RS/A S	CG/ POF	PT/A P	OF/D E	TOT SCF/ SF	Final Priority Index
1	City of Los Angeles	Valley Blvd.	B-485.8	746859N	UPRR	25259	70	0	5000	9	5	2	1	12.16	1	10.5	31.7	3567.9
2	Los Angeles County DPW	Valley View Avenue	2-158.4	027657G	BNSF/SCRRA	35994	129	0	5000	2	2	2	3	0	6	12	36.4	2822.3
3	Los Angeles County DPW	Nogales Street	3-22.4	811479J	UPRR/SCRRA	50945	45	0	5000	5	2	1	5	10.3	4	12	34.3	2785.4
4	Los Angeles County DPW	Norwalk Blvd/Los Nietos	BBJ-497.28 & 2-153.1	027649P & 027650J	BNSF/SCRRA	34616	129	0	10000	4	2	3	3	25.8	6	9	48.8	2281.5
5	San Mateo County Transportation Authority	San Bruno Avenue (City of San Bruno)	105E-11.0	754869P	PCJPB	31546	82	0	5,000	3	1	0	4	30.2	10	8.5	53.7	2123.1
6	City of Los Angeles	North Main Street	101VY-1.17 & 101EB-481.7	027607D & 811040M	SCRRA	14240	178	0	5000	3	3	1	0	21.52	9	10	44.5	2072.3
7	City of Irvine	Sand Canyon Ave	101OR-182.9	026765A	SCRRA	21244	71	0	5000	5	3	4	7	8	8	9	39	1849.0
8	Los Angeles County DPW	Fairway Drive	3-23.4	810883N	UPRR/SCRRA	31891	45	0	5000	5	3	2	5	9.5	4	10	33.5	1755.6
9	San Mateo County Transportation Authority	Linden Avenue (City of South San Francisco)	105E-10.2	754866U	PCJPB	8412	82	0	3000	5	1	0	4	13.2	10	5	33.2	1412.8
10	San Bernardino Associated Governments	University Parkway	2-76.6	026106V	BNSF	15815	96	0	5000	3	4	1	2	11	1	7.5	26.5	1241.1
11	San Joaquin County	West Lane	D-92.8	752897L	UPRR	23774	30	0	5000	7	3	1	2	8.8	2	7.5	25.3	1166.5

APPENDIX B – Grade Separation Priority List I.01-07-008 for Fiscal Year 2002-2003 by Rank (page 2 of 6)

	Agency	Crossing Location	PUC ID	DOT ID	Railroad	VEH	TRN	LTRN	COST	AH/ WC	BD/H C	VS/ SR	RS/A S	CG/ POF	PT/A P	OF/D E	TOT SCF/ SF	Final Priority Index
12	Los Angeles County DPW	Sierra Hwy	VY-69.33	750604Y	UPRR/ SCRRA	23269	27	0	5000	8	2	3	5	7.8	4	9	30.8	1161.7
13	City of Fresno	Shaw Ave	B-198.5	757316D	UPRR	37476	35	0	5000	3	3	2	4	11.92	0	9	29.9	1079.2
14	City of Riverside	Jurupa Ave & Mountain Ave	3-53.1 & 3- 53.3	81005Y & 811007M	UPRR	14147	56	0	6600	7	3	3	4	24.92	4	6	44.9	1005.2
15	City of Ontario	Miliken Avenue	B-525.4	746964P	UPRR	23,229	42	0	5000	4	3	1	4	6	1	7	22	997.6
16	San Mateo County Transportation Authority	Poplar Avenue (City of San Mateo)*	105E-17.2-B	754896L	PCJPB	11800	82	0	1000	6	8	0	0.6	4	6	5	29.6	997.2
17	City of Palmdale	Palmdale Boulevard	001B-413.70	750603S	UPRR/ SCCRA	33260	23.8	0	5000	4	2	2	5	9.2	3	9	30.2	821.8
18	City of Montclair	Monte Vista Avenue	B-517.4 & 3- 35.0	746936L & 810896P	UPRR	11638	96	0	5000	2	3	2	5	11	4	4	29	699.3
19	San Mateo County Transportation Authority	Ravenswood Avenue (City of Menlo Park)	105E-29.0	754991G	PCJPB	25090	84	0	10000	2	2	1	5	11.2	10	7	36.2	668.5
20	City of Lathrop	Lathrop Road	4-84.80	833920D	UPRR	12741	38	0	5000	5	5	3	4	7	3	9	31	612.0
21	Los Angeles County DPW	Avenue S	VY-66.92	750601D	UPRR/ SCRRA	26032	27	0	5000	3	2	5	3	11	4	8	33	595.3
22	Los Angeles County DPW	Turnbull Cyn Road	3-17.2	810867E	UPRR/SC RRA	15141	45	0	5000	3	3	1	5	10.56	4	5.5	29.1	574.1
23	City of Bakersfield	Beale-Truxton- Baker	2-885.6 2- 885.75 2- 885.77 2- 885.95 2- 886.2 2-886.4	028281T 028283G 028284N 028285V 028288R 028289X	BNSF	19864	52	0	14812	6	1	3	0	53.4	0	6.5	63.9	552.0
24	Los Angeles County DPW	Bandini Blvd.	3A-3.4 & 2- 147.1C	810924R	UPRR/ LAJR	23195	30	0	5000	2	2	2	5	10.9	2	6	27.9	445.4

APPENDIX B – Grade Separation Priority List I.01-07-008 for Fiscal Year 2002-2003 by Rank (page 3 of 6)

	Agency	Crossing Location	PUC ID	DOT ID	Railroad	VEH	TRN	LTRN	COST	AH/ WC	BD/H C	VS/ SR	RS/A S	CG/ POF	PT/A P	OF/D E	TOT SCF/ SF	Final Priority Index
25	City of Los Angeles	North Spring Street*	101VY-1.36A & 101EB-481.48A	027606W & 811042B	SCRRA	17,713	117	0	5000	10	0	5	0	4	4	3	26	440.5
26	City of Lathrop	Lathrop Road	D-82.1	752781K	UPRR	12741	25	0	5000	4	5	3	4	11	2	9	34	352.5
27	City of San Jose	Bailey Avenue	E-64.0	755148T	UPRR	6424	20	0	5018	10	1	3	6	20.2	3	7	40.2	321.9
28	City of Rancho Cucamonga	Haven Avenue	101SG-41.1	026157F	SCRRA	38,428	36	0	5,000	0	5	4	6	7	6	9	37	313.7
29	County of Riverside-Transportation	Bellegrave Ave/Rutile Street	3-47.10 & 3-47.30	810977P & 810978W	UPRR	13214	49	0	20000	7	2	3	4	20.6	4	9	42.6	301.6
30	City of Camarillo	Adolfo Road	E-417.9	753765E	UPRR	18019	39	0	5400.22	1	3	2	4	7	4	5	25	285.3
31	San Bernardino Associated Governments	Hunts Lane	B-541.0	747168J	UPRR	14716	41	0	5000	1	5	3	3	8	1	5.5	25.5	266.8
32	San Mateo County Transportation Authority	25th Avenue (City of San Mateo)	105E-19.7	754910E	PCJPB	12625	82	0	5000	0	1	1	5	11.6	10	9.5	38.1	245.2
33	City of Santa Clarita	Golden Valley Road	Proposed	Proposed	SCRRA	44000	25	0	5000	0	2	5	5	2	4	6	24	244
34	Tehama County Public Works	Aramayo Way	C-210.1	762275L	UPRR	5172	21	0	3228.28	5	3	5	1	8.6	1	6	24.6	226.5
35	City of Fremont	Paseo Padre Pkwy, High St, Main St, Washington Blvd	DA-32.1&4G-2.6,SA-32.65,DA-32.7,DA-32.8&4G-3.2	750056N&833878G,750057V,750058C,750059J&833879N,	UPRR	62178	14	0	5000	0	5	1	0	30.1	0	8	45.1	219.2
36	San Bernardino County	Glen Helen Pkwy	BB-480.1 & 2-71.0	747017U & 026103A	UPRR & BNSF	2280	99	0	5000	3	5	5	2	11.72	2	4	29.7	210.3
37	Kern County	Olive Drive	B-308.9	756945M	UPRR	18200	44	0	5000	0	3	3	4	7.6	0	7	24.6	184.8

APPENDIX B – Grade Separation Priority List I.01-07-008 for Fiscal Year 2002-2003 by Rank (page 4 of 6)

	Agency	Crossing Location	PUC ID	DOT ID	Railroad	VEH	TRN	LTRN	COST	AH/ WC	BD/H C	VS/ SR	RS/A S	CG/ POF	PT/A P	OF/D E	TOT SCF/ SF	Final Priority Index
38	City of Shafter	7th Standard Road	2-899.5	028381X	BNSF	5400	64	0	5000	1	3	5	5	6.8	4	6	29.8	168.0
39	City of Fremont	Warren Avenue	DA-36.2 & 4G-6.7	750073E& 833885S	UPRR	13388	17	0	5000	2	5	0	1	13	0	7	26	162.6
40	San Bernardino County	National Trails Hwy @Oro Grande*	2-30.6B	new	BNSF	6391	86	0	5000	6	8	5.9	3	8	6	0	36.9	146.8
41	Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority	Hamilton Ave/Creekside Way	1L-50.0	750165S	VT/UPRR	70000	6	210	5000	0	1	1	0	5.7	10	14	31.7	145.1
42	City of Camarillo	Las Posas Road	E-419.0	912013V	UPRR	18046	39	0	6121.36	0	3	3	4	7	4	5	26	141.0
43	Los Angeles County DPW	El Segundo Blvd.	BBH-492.6	747868R	UPRR/LA CMTA	15452	2	232	5000	2	1	1	2	12	10	11	37.0	77.0
44	City of Bakersfield	Q Street	B-311.8	757241G	UPRR	7175	36	0	5000	0	4	1	3	10.6	0	5	23.6	75.3
45	City of Bakersfield	Hageman Street	2-893.5B	Proposed	BNSF	15000	6	0	1545	0	3	5	0	3.5	0	4	15.5	73.7
46	Tehama County Public Works	South Avenue	C-202.3	762257N	UPRR	5244	21	0	3228.28	0	3	5	5	5	2	7	27	61.1
47	Tehama County Public Works	Bowman Road	C-238.3	762306H	UPRR	4418	21	0	2939.02	0	2	5	5	6.8	1	5	24.8	56.4
48	Los Angeles County DPW	Firestone Blvd	3A-7.8	810958K	UPRR	67517	2	0	5000	0	2	1	0	10	0	12	25	52.0
49	City of Vista	Vista Village Drive, Main St, Guajome St	106E-9.15, 9.2 & 9.6	917847T,0 27566B,02 7568P	SDNR/ NCTD	34934	1	0	20,000	3	4	2	0	23.5	0	10.5	40.0	47.0
50	Tehama County	San Benito Ave	C-215.8	762283D	UPRR	3666	21	0	3534	0	2	5	4	5.6	1	5	22.6	44.4

APPENDIX B – Grade Separation Priority List I.01-07-008 for Fiscal Year 2002-2003 by Rank (page 5 of 6)

	Agency	Crossing Location	PUC ID	DOT ID	Railroad	VEH	TRN	LTRN	COST	AH/ WC	BD/H C	VS/ SR	RS/A S	CG/ POF	PT/A P	OF/D E	TOT SCF/ SF	Final Priority Index
	Public Works	(Rivera)																
51	Los Angeles County DPW	Flores Street	3A-9.7	Proposed	UPRR	10850	13	0	5000	0	2	1	0	3.1	2	3	11.12	39.3
52	Kern County	Mohawk Street	2-890.1	028367C	BNSF	590	53	0	2528	0	4	5	5	5	5	2	26	38.4
53	Los Angeles County DPW	Slauson Avenue	BBH- 487.42&2H- 2.83	747839F & 027952L	UPRR/BN SF/LACM TA	31396	2	0	5000	0	3	1	0	9	0	11	24	36.6
54	City of Vista	Escondido Avenue	106E-10.1	027569W	SDNR/ NCTD	42390	1	0	5000	0	4	1	0	8.6	0	7.5	21.1	29.6
55	City of Vista	N. Melrose Drive	106E-7.5	026993M	SDNR/ NCTD	23573	1	0	5000	0	0	3	0	9.0	0	8.5	24.5	29.2
56	City of Vista	Mar Vista Drive	106E-11.2	027570R	SDNR/ NCTD	7999	1	0	5000	0	4	1	0	9.9	0	5	19.9	21.5

APPENDIX B – Grade Separation Priority List I.01-07-008 for Fiscal Year 2002-2003 by Rank (page 6 of 6)

Note: VEH- Vehicle, TRN – Train, LTRN – Light Rail Trains, COST – Project Cost

Formula For Crossing Nominated For Separation Or Elimination:

AH – Accident History

VS – Vehicular Speed Limit

CG – Crossing Geometrics

SCF - Special Conditions Factor

BD – Crossing Blocking Delay

RS – Rail Speed Limit

PT – Passenger trains

OF-Other Factors (Passenger Buses, School Buses, Hazmat Trains/Trucks, Community Impact)

**Formula For Existing Separations Nominated For Alteration or Reconstruction:*

WC – Width Clearance

SR – Speed Reduction

POF – Probability of Failure

DE – Delay Effects

HC-Height Clearance

AS – Accidents Near Structure

AP – Accident Potential

SF - Separation Factor

Railroad Abbreviations:

BNSF: The Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad Company

LACMTA: Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LAJR: Los Angeles Junction Railroad

NCTD: North (San Diego) County Transit Development Board

PCJPB: Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)

SCRRA: Southern California Regional Rail Authority (Metrolink)

SDNR: San Diego Northern Railway (Coaster)

UPRR: Union Pacific Railroad Company

VTa: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

(END OF APPENDIX B)